



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/672,030	09/26/2003	David L. Kaminsky	RSW920030152US1 (117)	7696

46320 7590 04/25/2007
CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL, LLP
STEVEN M. GREENBERG
950 PENINSULA CORPORATE CIRCLE
SUITE 3020
BOCA RATON, FL 33487

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, DUC M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2618

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/25/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/672,030	Applicant(s) KAMINSKY, DAVID L.	
	Examiner Duc M. Nguyen	Art Unit 2618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 February 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to applicant's response filed on 2/21/07. Claims 1-9 are now pending in the present application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims **1-9** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by **Flint** (US Pat. Number **5,825,353**) in view of **Awater** (US 2001/0010689) and Applicant's admitted prior art (Figure 1).

Regarding claim **5**, **Flint** discloses an integrated computer telephony system comprising:

at least one computer participating in a wireless computer network (see Figs. 4-5);

a cordless phone base station bound to a telephone outlet through a cabled connection (see Fig. 5 and col. 5, line 44 – col. 6, line 8); and

a wireless computer network adapter (Wireless Modem 209) and cordless handset circuit (Audio SP 42) both disposed in said at least one computer and configured to share common computing resources (processor 2) within said at least one

Art Unit: 2618

computer, said wireless network adapter establishing and maintaining data communications in said wireless network, said cordless handset circuit establishing and maintaining cordless telephony with said cordless phone base station (see Fig. 4 and col. 5, line 44 – col. 6, line 8);

As to limitation regarding the wireless computer network adapter is configured to wirelessly communicate with a wireless computer network of computing devices coupled to one another via a wireless access point, it is noted that utilizing a lap-top computer with a wireless phone for communicating a wireless access point is known in the art as disclosed by Awater (see [0003, 0004, 0011]), for providing a user a single device that can connect to a wireless local area network (wireless LAN) while in the work place, and can connect to a Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN) when outside of the work place (i.e, at home). Since Flint does suggests a local area network and a PSTN (see col. 2, line 65 – col. 3, line 4), and also suggests a base station for controlling appliances and provide remote access to external networks (see Fig. 7 and col. 6, lines 9-24), one skilled in the art would recognize that the computer phone in Flint would be applicable to the system in Awater or to the prior art system as shown in Fig. 1 of the specification as admitted by the Applicant as prior art and would work equally well. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify **Flint** to provide the computer phone in Flint with a wireless LAN access, thereby providing an access point as claimed, so that the computer phone can connect to a wireless local area network (wireless LAN) while in the work place.

Regarding claim 6, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 5 above. In addition, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify **Flint** so that the cordless handset transceiver and the wireless network adapter would transmit and receive data in different frequency spectrum as suggested by Awater (see [0034]), for allowing parallel operations or further reducing signal interferences.

Regarding claim 7, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 6 above. In addition, **Flint** would teach said wireless network adapter and said cordless handset circuit share common information transceiving circuitry with one another in a single personal computer device (see Flint, Fig. 4).

Regarding claim 1, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 5 above. In addition, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify **Flint** so that the cordless handset transceiver and the wireless network adapter would transmit and receive data in a common frequency spectrum as suggested by Awater (see [0026, 0030]), for cost saving. Note that Flint and Awater as modified would teach a multiplexer/demultiplexer as claimed (see Awater, [0026, 0059] or Flint, Fig. 1 regarding switches SW-1, SW-2), for preventing both transceivers from transmitting/receiving at the same time, in order to reduce signal interferences (see Awater, [0030]).

Regarding claim 2, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, Flint and Awater as modified would teach the cordless handset transceiver comprises a further configuration for coupling to a central processing unit,

audio processing circuitry and power supply within a computing device shared with said wireless network adapter (see **Flint**, Fig. 4 and Awater, Fig. 6), noting that a power supply would be an inherent feature for the integrated mobile device, in order to provide power to function the device.

Regarding claim 3, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, as admitted by Applicant in Fig. 2 as prior art, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to select the 2.4 GHz or ISM frequency spectrum as a common frequency spectrum for the integrated mobile device, for utilizing advantages of the unlicensed spectrum in most countries including the US (see also Awater, [0003]).

Regarding claim 4, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 2 above.

Regarding claims 8-9, the claims are interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, since utilizing a graphic user interface for conducting phone calls is well known in the art, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify **Flint** for utilizing a graphic user interface as claimed, for providing a user enhanced features of the computer device.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

See the attached PTO-892.

5. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300 (for **formal** communications intended for entry)

(571)-273-7893 (for informal or **draft** communications).

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Customer Service Window,
Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or communications from the examiner
should be directed to Duc M. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-7893,
Monday-Thursday (9:00 AM - 5:00 PM).

Or to Matthew Anderson (Supervisor) whose telephone number is (571) 272-
4177.

Duc M. Nguyen, P.E.

Apr 16, 2007

